DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 435 129 EA 030 113

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Research Design for "Kyosei" Western Assessment Collaborative at WestEd. |
| INSTITUTION | WestEd, San Francisco, CA. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC. |
| PUB DATE | 1997-11-00 |
| NOTE | 23p. |
| CONTRACT | RJ96006901 |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Evaluative (142) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC01 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Accountability; *Cooperative Programs; Educational Cooperation; Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Utilization; Professional Development; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation |

ABSTRACT

This document outlines the Western Assessment Collaborative's (WAC) approach to evaluation and the design for examining the progress and impact of Kyosei (spirit of cooperation), a multiyear partnership with 10 schools and 4 districts that engages participants in a set of integrated, research-based professional development strategies. The text describes the WAC and its work with a number of partner schools, districts, and professional development or school-reform networks. It explores the valuative tools used for Kyosei and other WAC activities and the goal to improve the work, assess outcomes and impacts, and generate and share knowledge. The paper outlines the evaluation design and explores how Kyosei provides the capacity for authentic accountability. The document then addresses four questions about Accountability Dialogues: (1) What are the characteristics of effective Accountability Dialogues? (2) Does participation in, and the implementation of, Accountability Dialogues result in authentic accountability and improved student performance? (3) What strategies are most effective to assist schools and districts in conducting Accountability Dialogues? and (4) How does one "scale up" the preparation of schools and districts to become authentically accountable? Some of the evaluation procedures are briefly described. The booklet includes two attachments that further explain accountability systems. (RJM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

EA

ED 435 129

# Research Design for "Kyosei" Western Assessment Collaborative at WestEd

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

November 1997

EA 030113

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WestEd

Improving Education through Research, Development and Service

# Table of Contents

I. Introduction ..... p. 1

II. About the Western Assessment Collaborative (WAC) and *Kyosei* ..... p. 1

III. Approach to Evaluation ..... p. 2

IV. The Evaluation Design ..... p. 3

A. WAC as Part of a Regional Educational Laboratory ..... p. 4

B. *Kyosei*: Building Capacity for Authentic Accountability ..... p. 4

C. Sampling ..... p. 9

D. Data Sources ..... p. 9

E. Analysis Plan ..... p. 12

V. Reports and Products ..... p. 13

VI. Attachments ..... p. 14

# Research Design for "Kyosei" Western Assessment Collaborative at WestEd

November 1997

This document is supported by federal funds from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, contract number RJ96006901. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.

## I. Introduction

This plan outlines the Western Assessment Collaborative's (WAC) approach to evaluation and the design for examining the progress and impact of *Kyosei* (spirit of cooperation), its multi-year partnership with schools and districts. Our work challenges schools to gather credible and useful performance data to guide continuous improvement, and we expect no less of ourselves. WAC's work is supported by embedded and ongoing activities that document and assess our activities, materials, implementation strategies, outcomes, and impact.

### About the Western Assessment Collaborative and *Kyosei*

WAC represents one of WestEd's primary strategies for supporting and studying whole school change. We help schools and districts establish standards for student performance, develop systems to measure achievement of those standards, and build the capacity and organizational culture to sustain standards-based reform. WAC centers its work on a vision of authentic accountability–one that moves beyond the accounting of grades and test scores to involve key decision makers throughout the school-community (parents, teachers, students, administrators, board members, and community members) in taking responsible action in response to identified needs. This vision incorporates the concepts of standards-based reform, meaningful public engagement and democratic decisionmaking and calls for inquiry and actions related to student performance. WAC emphasizes professional development strategies that support ongoing capacity building and organizational learning and promotes the use of assessment in the service of continuous improvement.

WAC works with a number of partner schools, districts, and professional development or school reform networks. *Kyosei*, our multi-year partnership with ten schools and four districts, engages participants in a set of integrated, research-based professional development strategies, including annual self-diagnostic and skill-building institutes, development and implementation of collaborative student performance plans, and an intensive summer work week each year. During each year of participation, *Kyosei* teams plan and conduct one or more Accountability Dialogues. The intent of these dialogues is to involve school-communities in "the construction of deep and commonly held understanding about the performance of the system, the reasons for the performance, the best possible ways of improving performance, and the responsibilities of each in doing so."[1]

*Kyosei* operates on the assumption that if schools make rigorous and genuine dialogue a fundamental part of their accountability system, then a shared and internalized sense of accountability will drive improvement. Through these dialogues we expect over time to see:

---

[1] Paul LeMahieu, *Authentic Assessment to Authentic Accountability* (unpublished), 1997.

- Increased community-wide understanding of standards for student performance,
- Increased access to rich and accurate student performance data,
- Increased capacity to generate meaningful and useful questions about student performance,
- Increased capacity to plan and implement focused action in the interest of improving performance,
- Expanded and more diverse participation in the dialogue and decisionmaking related to student performance, and
- Increased satisfaction with the pace and progress of improvement.

To use these Accountability Dialogues as both a window into and engine of the process of becoming authentically accountable, we've initiated a highly interactive research and development undertaking. The primary focus of our *development* efforts is the experimentation and expansion of professional development strategies that comprise *Kyosei*. What focuses our *research* efforts are, in turn, the Accountability Dialogues conducted by the following participating schools and districts:

- Bayside Middle School (San Mateo-Foster City School District, San Mateo County)
- Cupertino Union School District (Santa Clara County)
  - Sedgwick Elementary School
  - Stocklmeir Elementary School
- Galt Joint Union Elementary School District ( Sacramento County)
- International Studies Academy (San Francisco Unified School District, San Francisco County)
- Irvington High School (Fremont Unified High School District, Alameda County)
- Montair Elementary School District (San Ramon Valley Unified School District, Contra Costa County)
- Parkside Elementary School (San Mateo-Foster City School District, San Mateo County)
- San Leandro Unified School District (Alameda County)
- San Leandro Cluster (San Leandro Unified School District, Alameda County)
  - Thomas Jefferson Elementary School
  - Roosevelt Elementary School
  - Woodrow Wilson Elementary School
- San Mateo-Foster City Unified School District (San Mateo County)

WAC draws on its work with these *Kyosei* schools and districts to inform our broader work with other professional development and school reform networks.

**III. Approach to Evaluation**

Our approach to evaluation is to place critical inquiry at the core of what we do, to both inform and learn from *Kyosei* and other WAC activities. The three broad and interrelated goals of our evaluation are:

- ***To improve our work.*** Through formative feedback mechanisms we document progress, program design decisions, and implementation issues. We strive to work as a learning community that models the effective use of data to drive continuous improvement.
- ***To assess our outcomes and impact.*** Through summative accounts we hold ourselves accountable to measuring the extent to which we achieve our stated goals and advance reform.
- ***To generate and share knowledge.*** Through rigorous documentation and study of our work-in-progress, we distill key learnings in order to inform our practice and contribute to the practitioner, research, and policy communities.

To accomplish these evaluation goals, we are guided by a set of principles that influence the way we conduct research with our partnering schools and districts. These principles are:

- ***Begin Early.*** WAC has built evaluation activities into all aspects of our work, and with *Kyosei* we've established research partnerships with participating schools and districts from the onset. The establishment of these partnerships allows for building trust and research-support structures, buy-in from participants, and clarification about data collection responsibilities and constraints.
- ***Incorporate Multiple Methods.*** Our design uses both quantitative and qualitative methods to reinforce and inform one another. Using multiple methods further allows us to convey more varied information to different audiences.
- ***Maintain an Ongoing Information Exchange.*** WAC believes that evaluation is a catalyst for organizational learning. It requires the creation of feedback loops that use systematically collected information and socially-constructed knowledge to reflect upon and assess outcomes and impact.
- ***Develop Local Evaluation Capacity.*** WAC conducts research *with* not *on* our *Kyosei* partners. Our research and professional development activities are designed to teach evaluation logic and skills such as: setting goals, formulating questions, interpreting data, making data-based decisions, connecting processes to outcomes, and carrying out evaluation tasks.

## IV. The Evaluation Design

This evaluation design focuses on documenting and assessing *Kyosei*, and the Accountability Dialogues conducted in participating schools and districts. Since the set of professional development strategies that comprise *Kyosei* culminates minimally in an annual Accountability Dialogue, we have the opportunity to assess the extent to which these dialogues serve as both a window into and an engine of the process of becoming authentically accountable.

### A. WAC As Part of a Regional Educational Laboratory

*Kyosei* is one project within WAC, a key piece of the broader WestEd effort to support and study whole school change. WestEd, as one of a network of ten regional educational laboratories funded by the U.S. Department of Education, is charged with developing tools and strategies to enable practitioners and policymakers "to better put the pieces of educational change and improvement together in ways that will result in systemic education reform." All WAC evaluation activities are therefore guided by the regional educational laboratory's quality assurance system and performance indicator system. Specifically these guides require that:

- The content, quality, and usefulness of all WAC documents and events are assessed and the opinions and advice of external experts are consistently sought.
- All WAC products, services, and projects are evaluated.
- WAC collects data related to all relevant regional educational laboratory performance indicators (e.g., numbers of schools and teachers served, level of distribution of published documents).

### B. *Kyosei*: Building Capacity for Authentic Accountability

The overarching goal of *Kyosei is to support school-communities to conduct Accountability Dialogues that foster authentic accountability and lead to improved student performance.* To document *Kyosei* and assess its outcomes and impact, we've designed a study that focuses on four research questions:

1. **What are the characteristics of effective Accountability Dialogues?**

2. **Does participation in, and the implementation of, Accountability Dialogues result in authentic accountability[2] and improved student performance?**

3. **What strategies are most effective to assist schools and districts in conducting effective Accountability Dialogues?**

4. **How do we "scale up" the preparation of schools and districts to become authentically accountable?**

To address these questions thoroughly, we've developed performance indicators that illustrate incremental gains explicitly linked to our goal *of schools becoming increasingly authentically accountable.* What follows is an explication of the indicators related to each of the four research questions and proposed data sources to assess progress.

---

[2] "Authentic accountability" refers to the capacity (will, skill and resources) of all stakeholders to act responsively and responsibly in the interest of improved student performance. This construct is further defined by the WAC rubric for authentic accountability (see Attachment A).

## Question 1

**What are the characteristics of effective Accountability Dialogues?**

### Indicators

Planning of Accountability Dialogues is intentional. There is:

- An agenda that addresses student performance issues.
- A rationale for who should be included in the dialogue relative to the issues being discussed.
- A strategy for ensuring that all appropriate stakeholders are represented.
- Careful consideration is given to what participants need to know to actively participate in dialogues (i.e., to generate questions, analyze data, and take action).
- An effort to ensure a safe and welcoming climate that results in building a community and common sense of purpose.
- A match between the logistical arrangements and the agenda and needs of the participants (e.g., scheduling, length, room arrangements)

Facilitators have requisite skills and knowledge.

Participants and the larger school-community report a better understanding of what students in their school-communities are expected to know and be able to do.

Participants and the larger school-community report a better understanding of how well students in their school-communities are expected to perform.

Participants and the larger school-community report increasing satisfaction with the credibility and usefulness of the data available to them for decisionmaking. They:

- Understand the characteristics of credible and useful data to their own work and that of other decisionmakers.
- Increasingly demand data that are credible and useful.
- Increasingly use credible and useful data for decisionmaking.

Accountability Dialogues increasingly draw from all decisionmaking groups whose work affects student performance. They:

- Seek increasingly divergent perspectives.

Participants and the larger school-community report satisfaction that their needs, issues and personal concerns have been heard and valued in the dialogue. They:

### Data Sources

Accountability Dialogue Portfolios

Customized Participant Surveys

WAC's Memo-to-the-Record

Dialogue Narratives/Cases

Cross-*Kyosei* School or District Team Focus Group Interviews

*Kyosei* Student Performance Plans

*Kyosei* Team Diagnostic Activities Years 1 through 3

Documentation from Non-Educator Advisory Group Meetings



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Feel competent and confident enough to participate in the dialogue.

Accountability Dialogues generate increasingly focused and appropriately aligned (valid) actions in the interest of improved student performance. They:

- Generate appropriate questions to improve student performance.
- Take into consideration multiple courses of action.
- Result in planned action (e.g., agreed-upon timeline and process).
- Lead to action as a result of recommendations made at the dialogue.

Actions taken in response to recommendations made at Accountability Dialogues demonstrate a sense of shared responsibility for improvement of student performance.

Participants and the larger school-community report satisfaction with the progress of improvement. They:

- Understand and are satisfied with the accuracy of reports on the performance of the system.
- Understand the rationale for and are satisfied with recommendations made to improve the system.
- Understand the rationale and are satisfied with the actions taken as the result of recommendations made in the dialogue.

## Question 2

**Does participation in, and the implementation of, Accountability Dialogues result in authentic accountability and improved student performance?**

### Indicators

Participants and the larger school-community report a better understanding of what students in their school-communities are expected to know and be able to do.

Participants and the larger school-community report a better understanding of how well students in their school-communities are expected to perform.

Participants and the larger school-community report increasing satisfaction with the credibility and usefulness of the data available to them for decisionmaking. They:

- Understand the characteristics of credible and useful data to their own work and that of other decisionmakers.
- Increasingly demand data that are credible and useful.
- Increasingly use credible and useful data for decisionmaking.

Accountability Dialogues increasingly draw from all decisionmaking groups whose work affects student performance. They:

- Seek increasingly divergent perspectives.

Participants and the larger school-community report satisfaction that their needs, issues and personal concerns have been heard and valued in the dialogue. They:

- Feel competent and confident enough to participate in the dialogue.

Accountability Dialogues generate increasingly focused and appropriately aligned (valid) actions in the interest of improved student performance. They:

- Generate appropriate questions to improve student performance.
- Take into consideration multiple courses of action.
- Result in planned action (e.g., agreed-upon timeline and process).
- Lead to action as a result of recommendations made at the dialogue.

Actions taken in response to recommendations made at Accountability Dialogues demonstrate a sense of shared responsibility for improvement of student performance.

Participants and the larger school-community report satisfaction with the progress of improvement. They:

### Data Sources

Coaches' School or District Profiles

*Kyosei* Student Performance Plans

WAC's Memo-to-the-Record

Accountability Dialogue Portfolios

Customized Participant Surveys

Cross-*Kyosei* School or District Team Focus Group Interviews

*Kyosei* Team Diagnostic Activities Years 1 through 3



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Understand and are satisfied with the accuracy of reports on the performance of the system.
- Understand the rationale for and are satisfied with recommendations made to improve the system.

Understand the rationale and are satisfied with the actions taken as the result of recommendations made in the dialogue.

### Question 3

**What strategies are most effective to assist schools and districts in conducting Accountability Dialogues?**

**Indicators**

Self-diagnostic and skill-building institutes that result in:

- Rigorous self-assessment of school or district reform work relative to the rubric for authentic accountability.[3]
- Understanding of the concept of Accountability Dialogues.
- Understanding of the need for dialogue.

Student performance plans that result in demonstrable gains on the rubric for authentic accountability.

Summer work week tasks that result in demonstrable gains on the rubric for authentic accountability.

**Data Sources**

Coaches' School or District Profiles

WAC's Memo-to-the-Record

Student Performance Plans

Artifacts and Products from the Summer Work Week

Event Feedback Forms

Cross-*Kyosei* School or District Team Focus Group Interviews

[3] See Attachment B for a copy of WAC's rubric for authentic accountability.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**Question 4**

**How do we "scale up" the preparation of schools and districts to become authentically accountable?**

**Indicators**

Produce and disseminate publications that build awareness about the concept of authentic accountability and Accountability Dialogues.

Develop effective Accountability Dialogue facilitators' training and materials.

- Identify like-minded networks through which to adapt and disseminate *Kyosei* strategies and materials.
- Work with facilitators' network to disseminate WAC strategies and materials.

Carry out a WAC Accountability Dialogue in order to get feedback on the impact of our work and the viability of our strategies for scaling-up.

**Data Sources**

Feedback from practitioner and scholarly reviewers

Documentation from WAC Accountability Dialogue Meetings

**C. Sampling**

WAC anticipates the need to focus our data collection efforts at a sample of our partnering schools and districts. Although all *Kyosei* sites will contribute to the data sources discussed in the preceding section, some sites may be selected for a more in-depth investigation of particular lines of inquiry (e.g., supporting schools with large numbers of new teachers, differences between elementary and secondary schools engaged in standards-based reform, experimenting with scaling-up strategies).

**D. Data Sources**

This design relies on integrated methods and multiple measures. Each of the proposed data sources are discussed below:

***Event Feedback Forms***. Every *Kyosei* event includes time for reflection and assessment about the materials, strategies, and approaches used by WAC. These forms are customized for each event and are intended to elicit participant-level feedback that can be disaggregated by school or district, school level, role type, or other variable.

Data Collection Schedule: At each event

***WAC's Memo-to-the-Record.*** WAC staff are building a habit of semi-structured notetaking to systematically record key decisions, turning points, and shifts in thinking. These data will be routinely analyzed. This ongoing documentation of *Kyosei* allows for the immediate reconstruction of professional conversations that have implications for program design and delivery and analysis of data. Coaches also use this technique to chronicle their coaching experiences and predict the trajectory of reform in each school or district.

Data Collection Schedule: Bimonthly

***Accountability Dialogue Portfolios.*** These portfolios are collections of the following documentation provided by each *Kyosei* site conducting Accountability Dialogues: agendas and notes from planning meetings, copies of invitations, notes about invitation strategies, coaches notes about key design decisions, the agenda and artifacts from the dialogue, participant sign-in sheet with roles identified, copies of participant logs (if possible), and summary analysis of customized participant surveys. Each school or district team is also responsible for producing a videotape documenting their Accountability Dialogues.

Data Collection Schedule: Annually, following each Accountability Dialogue

***Customized Participant Surveys.*** WAC will customize a participant survey for each school or district producing an Accountability Dialogue that is tailored to the work in that school or district while still providing comparable cross-site level information on the indicators above. The focus of these surveys will be to assess changes in understanding of key concepts, satisfaction with the data, and motivation to take action based upon recommendations that emerge from the dialogue.

Data Collection Schedule: Annually, following each Accountability Dialogue

***Cross-*Kyosei *School or District Team Focus Group Interviews.*** WAC will convene a cross-*Kyosei* group to conduct a focus group interview. The questions will be directed at research findings or *Kyosei* design issues that need further examination, reinforcement, verification, or elaboration.

Data Collection Schedule: Annually

**Kyosei *Student Performance Plan.*** Each *Kyosei* school or district team will develop a student performance plan that establishes a student performance goal, identifies appropriate indicators, identifies data sources and collection strategies, establishes the performance standards and aligned assessments, and analyzes the data. These site-level data will be reported to WAC in order to assess our impact on student performance. The student performance plan is used to determine the coaching intervention WAC will offer each *Kyosei* school or district and the data generated by the plan will become the focus of the Accountability Dialogue.

Data Collection Schedule: Annually

**Kyosei *Team Diagnostic Activities Years 1 through 3.*** Each *Kyosei* school or district team will participate in an intensive self-diagnostic activity to assess the progress of its school-community. The teams rate on a five-point scale from "No Progress" to "Fully Developed and Realized" all of the elements that comprise the high end of the WAC rubric for authentic accountability that describe a realized vision of authentic accountability. Supporting evidence for the rating is also required. These data assess progress over time with a comparable set of key variables across all sites. Year 1 diagnostic data serves as a baseline for each site.

Data Collection Schedule: Annually

***Coaches' School or District Profiles.*** WAC coaches will construct a detailed profile of each *Kyosei* site using data from diagnostic activities, observations, site visits, and a document review (e.g., WAC application, BASRC funding application, standards documents). These profiles will serve as an additional source of baseline information during Year 1 and as a communication tool throughout the partnership.

Data Collection Schedule: Annually

***Artifacts and Products from the Summer Work Week.*** WAC will reproduce, collect, and analyze all artifacts and products developed during the summer work week to assess the extent to which the teams made demonstrable gains on the rubric for authentic accountability. The artifacts and products could be: newly designed assessment strategies, plans to develop standards, standards documents, collections of exemplars, rubric for authentic accountability, analyses of student performance data.

Data Collection Schedule: Annually

***Dialogue Narratives/Cases.*** WAC staff are building a habit of synthesizing data from multiple sources to construct compelling stories about reforming schools and districts and the type of support required to foster authentic accountability. These stories may become grist for the development of training cases for a facilitators' guidebook. Each year we will write a minimum of three stories.

Data Collection Schedule: Ongoing

***Documentation from Non-Educator Participant Advisory Group Meetings.*** WAC will convene an annual non-educator advisory group from cross-*Kyosei* sites to enrich our understanding of the public engagement process. Documentation of these meetings is intended to elicit participant-level feedback that can be disaggregated by community type, role type, or other variable.

Data Collection Schedule: Annually

***Documentation from WAC Accountability Dialogue Meetings.*** WAC is taking a novel approach to the conventional use of an advisory board by modeling the Accountability Dialogue process with its own community of "critical friends". WAC will convene a group of "critical friends" and facilitate a conversation about our performance using data generated at *Kyosei* sites. Documentation of these meetings is intended to elicit participant-level feedback about our data collection practices, *Kyosei* design, preliminary research findings, or other issues.

Data Collection Schedule: Annually

***Feedback from Practitioner and Scholarly Reviewers.*** WAC solicits commentary from practitioner and scholarly reviewers for all materials, strategies, and approaches used in *Kyosei*. These data are used to guide and inform the design, evolution, and dissemination of our work.

Data Collection Schedule: Ongoing

**E. Analysis Plan**

Because we are in the early stages of evaluating *Kyosei*, many of the data sources described above are currently being developed, piloted, and revised. To-date, descriptive statistics were performed on all survey items from the *Kyosei* institutes, including calculations of mean, range, minimum and maximum, and frequency distribution. Qualitative data from open-ended items were summarized. In the future, qualitative data from key data sources, such as the Memo-to-the-Record and the customized participant surveys from the Accountability Dialogues, will be summarized using a coding scheme and reported by computing the mean, range, minimum and maximum, and frequency

distribution. Once all the instrumentation has been completed, a detailed analysis plan will be developed and submitted as an addendum to this evaluation plan.

**V. Reports and Products.**

WAC prepares summary data reports of all key events and furnishes periodic information about diagnostic-level data, accomplishments, progress, and problem areas to participating school and districts. Our routine reporting schedule meets the specific reporting requirements of our funders.

In addition, WAC will produce the following:

- ***Accountability Dialogue Stories***. We will produce a minimum of three stories each year that synthesize data from multiple sources to document, describe, and examine an individual account of a dialogue. These stories may be further developed into training cases for dialogue facilitators.

- ***Facilitators' Guidebook Series***. In 1997 we published the first in this series titled *Standards: Community-wide Constructions of the Meaning of Quality*. Other proposed topics include *Facilitating Accountability Dialogues*. We are building a knowledge base about designing and conducting effective Accountability Dialogues. A summary of key learnings will be incorporated into the materials, content and delivery of a facilitators' guidebook for the purpose of building a corps of professionals with the capacity to support a larger number of schools and district in becoming authentically accountable.

- ***Monthly Newsletters.*** These one-page briefs are both a teaching tool and communication strategy for the school-communities associated with the *Kyosei* schools and districts. They discuss key issues related to standards, assessment, and accountability and address the challenges and progress of reform work at the participating sites.

- ***Progress Reports***. These periodic reports summarize our research to date and document both the issues raised at WAC's own Accountability Dialogues and plans for follow-up action.

# VI. Attachments

# A VISION OF AUTHENTIC ACCOUNTABILITY

**Attachment A**

**Clarity About Standards**

1. The school-community agrees on the value of setting agreed-upon high standards for student performance.
2. The school-community maintains an inclusive ongoing process to determine
   - what students should know and be able to do
   - how well they must do those things
   - what kind of learning opportunities students need to reach the standards
3. Standards for student performance guide
   - curriculum and instruction
   - school structure
   - organizational decision making
   - resource allocations
   - accountability mechanisms
4. Student progress and achievement is reported in relation to standards.
5. The school-community has determined appropriate benchmarks of progress toward these standards.
6. Students are familiar with the standards and have access to exemplars that illustrate a variety of ways to demonstrate achievement.

**Who Needs Data?**

1. The school-community has identified who needs data/information in order to take responsible/responsive action in the interest of improved student performance.
2. All decision makers with responsibility toward improved student performance have identified the kind, amount and quality of data they need to act in the best interest of student learning.
3. All decision makers with responsibility toward improved student performance have access to the data they need to do their work.
4. The school-community engages in ongoing dialogue that creates an increasingly rich and accurate picture of student performance.

**Access to Good Data**

1. Assessments provide data in relation to school-community standards for student performance.
2. Adequate investment is made in both instructional assessments (diagnostic/formative) and in evaluative assessments (summative) used for public accounting.
3. A variety of assessment tools are used in combination to provide a useful and credible picture of student performance.
4. Available data are valid and credible.
5. All decision makers have the capacity to access data when needed for decision making.
6. Adequate resources and technology are available to collect and analyze data as needed.
7. Data are available in a timely manner to all who need it.

**Analyzing the Data**

1. Teachers have the capacity to analyze student work as an ongoing source of data for instructional planning.
2. All decision makers understand both the potential and the limitations of available data.
3. Members of the school-community habitually ask increasingly rigorous and refined questions of available data.
4. Data are disaggregated in purposeful ways (e.g., by gender, by ethnicity and language by program participation).
5. Data are increasingly examined in relation to one another (e.g., How many girls who did well in elementary school math participate in college prep science or math classes?).
6. Data are increasingly analyzed for progress over time (i.e., longitudinal analysis).
7. Members of the school-community habitually seek new sources of data aligned to new questions.
8. School-community norms support honest, rigorous analysis of data in an atmosphere of mutual respect for all.

**Responsible/Responsive Action**

1. Data are gathered and analyzed for the purpose of taking action.
2. All decision makers have the habit of planning action based on data.
3. The value of each assessment strategy is weighed in relation to its usefulness in helping school-community decision makers take responsible action to improve student performance.
4. The actions taken in response to data are appropriate to the purpose of the assessment given and the quality of the data generated.
5. Data are used primarily to increase or enhance (not deny) opportunities to learn (for students, teachers or the school).

**Building Capacity for Authentic Accountability**

1. Members of the school-community recognize and accept shared responsibility for contributing to student performance. The school-community demonstrates a pervasive sense of internal accountability.
2. All decision makers have the responsibility and the capacity to use data to make informed decisions about their work.
3. Teachers habitually diagnose as they teach.
4. The analysis of student work becomes increasingly embedded in day-to-day professional practice.
5. Educators and policy makers are held accountable for:
   - knowing and organizing their work around agreed-upon standards
   - gathering and using data for decision making
   - responsible /responsive actions based on data
6. The school-community demonstrates increasing confidence in its capacity to continuously improve.
7. The quality of student learning is central to "school talk."
8. Teachers and students demonstrate a strong sense of professional or personal efficacy (i.e. They believe they can make a difference).

Western Assessment Collaborative at WestEd

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

| Team Discussion | Completing Your Planning Document |
|---|---|
| **Step 1:**<br>**Establish Your Student Performance Goal**<br><br>Ask yourselves:<br>Is this an accurate description of a performance standard to which we aspire?<br>Is it too broad or too narrow to define our work?<br>What work does it suggest you need to do? | Rewrite your student performance goal, if necessary. (Revisions must include an implied "cut point" ie. it should include words like "meets standard" or "satisfactorily achieves".)<br><br>At the top of your chart record your school's/district's name and the student performance goal. |
| **Step 2:**<br>**Develop or Articulate Indicators**<br><br>Ask yourselves:<br>Have you determined what students will know or do if they have achieved this standard?<br>If yes, in what existing documents are they represented?<br>Who needs to and does "own" them?<br>Is the list of indicators complete and detailed enough to suggest appropriate instructional activities or assessments. | Indicate on your chart where we can find those indicators, or;<br><br>Make a note that this is work that needs to be done or done with greater input from others. |
| **Step 3:**<br>**Select Data Collection Strategies**<br><br>Ask yourselves:<br>Do you have assessments that provide evidence of all of your indicators?<br>Are they credible and useful for guiding instructional planning?<br>Are they credible and useful for reporting achievement?<br>Do you need others? To assess what outcomes?<br>Have the "right" people been involved in making these decisions? | List the assessments you are currently using to assess the indicators.<br><br>Make notes indicating what other assessments you feel you need most and why. (Who needs them? and for what?) |

## Attachment B

| | |
|---|---|
| **Step 4:**<br>**Establishing "Good Enough"**<br><br>Ask Yourselves:<br>Have you determined the performance standard (How good is good enough?) on any of the assessments you are currently using?<br>Do you want combine information from one or more assessments to establish a performance standard for the entire subject area? Why or Why not?<br>Have the "right" people been involved in making these decisions? | Write down the performance standard(s) you have established and tell who was involved in making this decision.<br><br>Make notes indicating what you may still need to do to establish a performance standard(s). |
| **Step 5:**<br>**Analyze Your Data**<br><br>Ask yourselves:<br>Does your data indicate which students met the standard?<br>Is your data in an accessable format for analysis?<br>What other data might you need?<br>Does your data provide any way of exploring why students performed the way they did and how they might be helped to improve?<br>Have the "right" people been involved in making these decisions? | Make notes about your data analysis needs. |

When you have gone through all the planning steps appropriate to your team's work, discuss and record your team's answers to the following questions:

1. This year we plan to do the following in order to become better able to report on, and improve achievement of, this student performance standard.
2. The help we need most in doing that is_____. (List in order of priority)